

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARNITHA HILL, et al,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-01625 DJC AC PS

ORDER

On February 16, 2024, defendants filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's second amended complaint, set to be heard on April 10, 2024. ECF No. 32. The motion was taken under submission. ECF No. 33. Per Local Rules 230(c), plaintiff was required to file an opposition or notice of non-opposition within 14 days of the motion being filed. In this case, the deadline was March 1, 2024. Plaintiffs did not file an opposition or statement of non-opposition.

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiffs shall show cause, in writing, within 14 days, why their failure to respond to the pending motion should not result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The filing of an opposition or statement of non-opposition within this timeframe will serve as cause and will discharge this order. If plaintiffs fail to respond, the court will recommend dismissal of this case pursuant to


///

///

1 Local Civil Rule 110. Because significant litigation has already occurred in this case, the
2 recommendation will be for dismissal with prejudice.

3 IT IS SO ORDRED.

4 DATED: March 6, 2024

5 
6 ALLISON CLAIRE
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28